

09/662,072  
Page 11 of 13

### REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 3, 5-29, 32, 34-59, 61, and 62 are pending, in which claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, and 60 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 3, 8-11, 14, 18-22, 25-29, 32, 37-40, 43, 47-50, and 52-59 are currently amended, and new claims 61 and 62. Care was exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

The Office Action mailed December 2, 2003 rejected claims 1-7, 10-21, 25, 26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Alles et al.* (US 6,499,976), claims 9, 22, 24, 27, and 28 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Alles et al.* in view of *Dillon et al.* (US 6,519,651), claim 23 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Alles et al.* in view of *Dillon et al.* in view of *Jorgensen* (US 6,590,885), and claim 9 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Alles et al.* in view of *Klaus* (US 5,892,903). Additionally, claims 1 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 1 and 30 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph moot.

To advance prosecution and reduce issues, claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, and 60 have been canceled. Further, claims 3 and 32 have been recast in independent form, and incorporate the features of claims 4 and 33; namely, these claims recite spoofing "only connections of the first type associated with at least one of applications with high throughput and applications for which reduced startup latency is desired."

To meet the above features, the Office Action, on page 4, applies *Alles et al.*, citing col. 12: 52-58. Applicants respectfully disagree with the interpretation adopted by the Office Action, as *Alles et al.* provides no such disclosure. The cited passage states the following:

Service rule 520 attempts to accept and encrypt all HTTP, SMTP, and TELNET traffic from and to SubsA. **Processing rule(s) may be generated for each of HTTP, SMTP, and TELNET.** The protocol types and port numbers for these three applications are pre-specified, and

accordingly processing rules may be generated statically assuming the IP addresses (for SubsA and other offices) are also known.

At best the above passage discloses, in general terms, that processing rules are generated for the various protocols (i.e., HTTP, SMTP, and TELNET). There is no mention of spoofing "only connections ... associated with at least one of applications with high throughput and applications for which reduced startup latency is desired."

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed in a prior art reference, based on the foregoing, it is clear that *Alles et al.* does not anticipate claims 3 and 32.

Additionally, the secondary references of *Dillon et al.*, *Jorgensen*, and *Klaus*, which were applied for features other than the above features, do not cure the deficiencies of *Alles et al.* Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

Turning now to newly added claim 61, this claim recites "determining which of the plurality of connections, according to the respective applications, is to receive priority processing for transport over a backbone connection established over the satellite network; **compressing data streams associated with the priority connections based on a transmission constraint of the backbone connection.**" The Office Action, on page 6, contends that *Alles et al.* discloses a "compression/encryption element," citing to col. 12: 24-38. Close examination of this passage reveals only a general discussion on encrypting "matching data using 3xDES encryption protocol," without any mention of "compression."

09/662,072  
Page 13 of 13

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (301) 601-7252 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



March 1, 2004

Craig L. Plastrik  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41,254

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION  
RE/R11/A109  
2250 East Imperial Highway  
El Segundo, California 90245